



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

duplicate of the head in clay (p. 153) points to the cutting off of this seat of life, so exhaustively treated by Wiedemann. The alleged Egyptian influence on Jewish ideas (p. 169) is not successfully illustrated. Still more unfortunate is the reviving of the old theories about Egyptian influences on Moses and his contemporaries, for example, the long-refuted comparison of the "golden calves" and the Apis cult (p. 167). I repeat, the booklet gives about as good a picture of a complicated and wide subject as could be given in such limited space, and some further minor criticisms would not alter this judgment.

W. MAX MÜLLER.

Greece from the Coming of the Hellenes to A. D. 14. By E. S. SHUCKBURGH, Litt.D. [The Story of the Nations.] (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1905. Pp. xix, 416.)

THE author of this smoothly written history has "tried throughout to lay stress upon the political, intellectual, and artistic achievements of the Greeks, rather than on the history of military operations" (p. vii). "The thought of the Greeks and the things done in Greece" form his general theme. We are thus justified in expecting much from the book. It belongs, of course, to a popular series, and can count upon a large circle of readers. Hence it is important that it represent the best modern opinion on the subject. It does not. It contains simply the traditional exposition of Greek history, extended at the end, because of the general insistence that Hellenistic affairs have been too long neglected, not by the new interpretation of the third century B. C., but by a detailed account of the Roman conquest and organization of the East.

The book shows no evidence of contact with continental scholarship since the days of Karl Otfried Müller's *Dorians*. Wilamowitz, Meyer, Busolt, and Beloch have been neither an inspiration nor a warning to Dr. Shuckburgh; but these gentlemen have no right to charge him with national antipathy, for he has treated Bury, his own countryman, with similar indifference. It need hardly be said that writers of less comprehensive works have been ignored also. What sort of a Greek history is possible under these circumstances?

The extension of the name Pelasgian in the post-Homeric literature has no significance for the author, nor does he think the view worth mentioning that Achæan, as a generic term, is an epic convention (pp. 11 *et seqq.*). For him the Pelasgians and the Achæans are real races, as real almost as the Hellenes, who (subdivided into Aeolians, Ionians, and Dorians) succeeded them some time before 800 B. C. The Achæans are Homer's people: the Hellenes Hesiod's. Herodotus and Thucydides (God forgive them) stand sponsors for the Pelasgians. And so it goes—hard against the grain of one who has painfully unlearned these opinions.

The work has many apt characterizations and fine pieces of descrip-

tion, but it abounds with misleading half-truths and positive blunders. Thus: Delphi, says Dr. Shuckburgh, "became also the national banking-house, in which most of the leading states had treasure-houses," etc. (p. 42). *Ἀρχήματα δὲ*, says Pausanias (X. 11), *οὕτως ἐνταῦθα ἔδουσιν ἅν οὕτως ἐν ἄλλω τῶν θησαυρῶν*. It is not true that the Pylagorae "represented the great branches of the Greek race, so many being sent by Dorian, Ionian, and Æolian states respectively" (p. 46). The old error is repeated that in all the Greek states "the slaves were more numerous than the free"; or does the author draw no distinction between serfs and slaves (p. 52)? "Military commanders", says Dr. Shuckburgh (p. 62), "were from the first elected, and not chosen by lot." Yet "the archons [of whom the polemarch, who "till some time after B. C. 490 . . . took command in the field" (p. 61), was one] from very early times were appointed by lot either directly from the four primitive tribes, or from a number of names selected by them (*ἐκ προαρχίων*)" (p. 62). What evidence is there for the local division into men of the heights, men of the plain, and men of the sea-coast prior to the legislation of Solon (*ibid.*)? Is it not high time that the sequence, Draco, Cylon, was abandoned, and the view given up that the policy of trying the Alcmaeonidae for sacrilege originated with Solon (p. 67)? There should be no doubt that the Seisachtheia was a direct cancelling of debts (p. 68). The Solonian assessments were maintained throughout the fifth century (p. 73). There is no evidence that the Thetes were *ever* qualified for the financial offices, the archonships, or the army (*ibid.*). Registration on the deme-list took place at eighteen, not at sixteen (*ibid.*). The theory that one thousand of the six thousand jurymen annually enrolled were kept in reserve to revise the laws was disproved twenty years ago (p. 74). No one with Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens*, section 22, before him should repeat the transparent story that Kleisthenes was ostracized (*ibid.*). The revolt of Cyrus was fixed in 553 B. C. (not in 559, p. 83) by the cylinder of Nabunaid found in 1881. What warrant is there for the statement (p. 107) that "before B. C. 484 the state [Athens] was able to maintain at least two hundred" triremes? The Acropolis was ravaged in 480: Athens was not burned till 479 (p. 117). Constantine followed Plataea by eight not seven hundred years (p. 124). There is no trustworthy authority for the view that the suppression of piracy was an object of the Delian Confederacy (p. 129). The reviewer finds it incredible that "It was understood [in 478/7] that each state [in the Delian Confederacy] was to have a democratic government more or less after the model of the Athenian" (p. 130). Athens policed its empire by sixty not seventy ships (*ibid.*). The walls of Athens were constructed in 479 not 477 (p. 135). There was no entrance-fee for the theatre (p. 139): the state compensated the poor for their attendance. It is not true that the *phoros* was increased by one-third between 478 and 440 (p. 145). On the contrary it had decreased somewhat.

But enough of details. It is of course impossible to enumerate here

the thousand and one places in which the contents of the book might have been enriched, the emphasis altered, or the analysis strengthened by consulting the modern literature. The author seems to have taken his task too lightly. He has acquired only a superficial acquaintance with Greek historiography. He has failed to co-ordinate properly the data supplied by Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens* with the facts previously known; and his treatment of the social and economic development lacks substance and reality through his neglect to use the statistics so laboriously gathered from the ancient books, coins, sites, stones, and papyri. The result is a work of some literary merit, but one pregnant with mischief through restating old misconceptions in graceful language. And yet there was an urgent need for somebody to do for Greek history what Wilamowitz has recently done for Greek literature, to animate a scholarly summary of recent work with the breath of a genial personality.

W. S. FERGUSON.

Ancient Legends of Roman History. By ETTORE PAIS. Translated by MARIO E. COSENZA. (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company. 1905. Pp. xiv, 336.)

This volume is made up of lectures given before the Lowell Institute in the winter of 1904-1905, supplemented by others delivered at the universities of Harvard, Columbia, Wisconsin, and Chicago. It "contains special and minute demonstrations of subjects already succinctly treated" in the author's *Storia di Roma*, the scope and nature of which may be indicated by a list of some of the titles: The Excavations in the Forum Romanum, and their Importance for the Most Ancient Roman History; Acca Larentia, the Mother of the Lares and Nurse of Romulus; The Saxum Tarpeium; The Legends of the Horatii, and the Cult of Vulcan; The Fabii at the River Cremera and the Spartans at Thermopylæ; On the Topography of the Earliest Rome; etc. The lectures proper are followed by six elaborate excursuses on such topics as: The Authenticity of the Etruscan Tile from Capua, and the Supremacy of the Etruscans in Campania; The Relations between the Square Palatine, the Square Palisades in Emilia, and the Pretended Terramara of Tarentum; and Servius Tullius and the Lex Ælia-Sentia.

The first lecture, on the critical method to be pursued in the study of early Roman history, is a brief statement of the principles which the author has already laid down in his *Storia di Roma*. The first volume of this work appeared in two parts, in 1898 and 1899, and was devoted to an exhaustive criticism of the sources of the traditional history of Rome down to the time of Pyrrhus. It has been widely discussed and many of its conclusions vigorously opposed, but most scholars will at least agree with Holzapfel's recent statement: "es verdient daher sein Werk, dessen Lektüre stets zu weiterem Nachdenken anregt, . . . bei allen Forschungen auf dem Gebiet der älteren römischen Geschichte die eingehendste Berücksichtigung."